IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

C.A. No. 05-614 (SLR)
, ,

DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

A. Conversion

1.	Do you find that plaintiffs Bavarian Nordic and Anton Mayr have proven, by a preponderance
of the	evidence, that defendants intentionally converted property owned by one of the plaintiffs?
У	ves no
	answer "yes" to question 1, you must continue on to question 2. If you "no" to question 1, you nove to question 9 and skip questions 2 through 8.
2.	What do you find is the converted property? (indicate which letter here)
a.	The right to commercialize the MVA viruses;
b.	The vials of MVA 572 sent to NIH; or
c.	The vials of MVA 577 sent to Acambis.

If you answer a, "the right to commercialize the MVA viruses," you must move to question 9 and skip questions 3 through 8. If you answered either b, "the vials of MVA 572 sent to NIH," or c, "the vials of MVA 577 sent to Acambis," you must continue on to question 3.

3.	Who do you find owned this converted property at the time of conversion?		
(indi	cate which letter h	re)	
a.	Plaintiff Bavaria	n Nordic; or	
b.	Plaintiff Anton	Лayr.	
	-	ff Anton Mayr," you must move onto question 9 and skip questions 4 thro iintiff Bavarian Nordic" you must continue on to question 4.	ugh
4.	Do you find tha	plaintiffs unreasonably delayed in bringing this lawsuit and that this d	elay
has p	orejudiced defenda	ts?	
	yes	no	
		question 4, you must move to question 9 and skip questions 5 through δ stion 4, you must continue on to question 5.	3. If
5.	Do you find tha	plaintiffs acted with unclean hands?	
	_yes	no	
		question 5, you must move to question 9 and skip questions 6 through δ stion 5, you must continue on to question 6.	3. If
6.	What do you fir	d was the value of the converted property at the time of conversion?	
	\$		
7.	Do you find tha	plaintiffs should be awarded punitive damages?	
	yes	no	
		uestion 7, you must move to question 9 and skip question 8. If you ans must continue on to question 8.	wer

8.	What is the amount of punitive damages that you award?		
	\$		
В.	Deceptive Trade Practices		
9.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence,		
that de	fendants caused likelihood of confusion or of misunderstanding concerning MVA3000 and its		
affiliat	tion, connection, or association with, or certification by, another in violation of Delaware's		
Decep	tive Trade Practices Act?		
y	es <u>no</u>		
10.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence,		
that de	fendants represented that MVA30000 has a sponsorship, approval, characteristics, ingredients,		
uses, b	enefits, or quantities that it does not have in violation of Delaware's Deceptive Trade Practices		
Act?			
y	es <u>no</u>		
11.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence,		
that de	fendants represented that MVA3000 is of a particular standard, quality, or grade in violation		
of Del	aware's Deceptive Trade Practices Act?		
V	es no		

12.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence,
that c	defendants disparaged plaintiff Bavarian Nordic's MVA-BN vaccine by false or misleading
repre	sentation of fact in violation of Delaware's Deceptive Trade Practices Act?
	yesno
C.	Unfair Competition
13.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence,
that c	defendants engaged in unfair competition in violation of the Lanham Act?
	yesno
	answer "yes" to question 13, you must answer questions 14 through 19. If you answer "no" estion 11 you must sign and date the verdict form, skipping questions 14 through 19.
14.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence,
that c	defendants misrepresented the origin of the MVA3000 vaccine?
***************************************	yesno
15.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence,
that o	defendants made literally false statements to the U.S. Government regarding the MVA3000
vacci	ne?
	yesno

16.	Do you find that plaintiff Bavarian Nordic has proven, by a preponderance of the evidence		
that	defendants mad	e deceptive statements to	the U.S. Government concerning MVA3000 that
actua	ally confused the	U.S. Government?	
	yes	no	
17.	Do you find t	hat plaintiffs unreasonably	delayed in bringing this lawsuit and that this delay
has p	orejudiced defend	dants?	
	yes	no	
		1	ign and date the verdict form, skipping questions 18 u must continue to question 18.
18.	Do you find t	hat plaintiffs acted with u	nclean hands?
	yes	no	
	*	to question 18, you must s o question 18, you must co	ign and date the verdict form, skipping question 19. ontinue to question 19.
19.	What do you	find were defendants' ne	t profits arising out of their violation of the unfair
com	petition in violat	ion Lanham Act?	
	\$		

Each juror must sign the verdict form to reflect that a unanimous verdict has been reache		
Dated:	, 2007	
P		-
Foreperson		
		-
		-
		_
		_
		_
		_

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

/s/ James W. Parrett, Jr. (#4292)

Mary B. Graham (#2256) Rodger D. Smith II (#3778) James W. Parrett, Jr. (#4292) 1201 North Market Street P.O. Box 1347 Wilmington, DE 19899 302.658.9200

OF COUNSEL:

William D. Coston
Jeffrey A. Dunn
Martin L. Saad
Tamany J. Vinson Bentz
VENABLE, LLP
575 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004-1601
202.344.4000

Attorneys for Acambis Inc. and Acambis plc

Dated: May 4, 2007

820452